

**REMARKS**

The Official Action has been carefully considered, as well as the references cited along with it. Claim 18 is amended for correction consistent with the Specification. The others are resubmitted. It is believed that the claims as now presented define invention patentable over the references. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Regarding specific claims, claims 11, 14, 17 and 20 were rejected under Section 102(b) as anticipated by Potters et al. Patent No. 3,130,070. Reconsideration is requested for several reasons. First of all, the art to which the reference relates is not-analogous to the art to which Applicant's claims are directed. More specifically, claimed invention is a blending and dispensing assembly. Potters et al. discloses a method and apparatus for coating discrete particles (Potters col. 1, l. 8-10) fed to the apparatus from a "hopper 6". In contrast, Applicant's claim 11 recites, among other details, that the inlet end is configured to fit and seal against a base product delivery end outlet of a flowable mixture dispenser head. So it is seen that the input of glass beads or other discrete particles to be coated in Potters et al., could be a supply dumped from a front-end loader or other vehicle and simply stored in the hopper 6 for processing. In contrast, the recited inlet end of Applicant's claimed assembly is "configured to fit and seal against a base product delivery end outlet of a flowable mixture dispenser head--". This same recital (except for using "mix" instead of "mixture") is present in Applicant's claim 17. In contrast, the input to the Potters apparatus is not similar in either form or control to that disclosed in Applicant's specification and specifically recited in Applicant's Claims 11 and 17.

Secondly, the Potters reference shows and describes for the inlet, only a cone shaped hopper 6, but there is no description of how or when the hopper is filled. Certainly

there is no description or suggestion that it either fits or seals anything that fills it. It is simply a hopper, as identified in column 2 at line 54. So the reference clearly does not show or suggest what is clearly recited in Applicant's claims 11 and 17.

Applicant's claim 11 (not 17) also recites the manifold on the assembly with "multiple passageways in the manifold". The Potters et al. reference shows a trough 30 with sidewalls 32 and splash boards 33 forming upward extensions of the walls (column 3, lines 49-55). It says the cover 34 serves to substantially enclose the trough 30. But the cover has a longitudinally extending slot 56 (column 5, line 73). This enables movement of the coating material outlet of the hose 48 longitudinally of the trough. This construction clearly does not show or suggest a manifold, nor are there multiple passageways in the trough, so it is clear that the Potters et al. patent does not disclose nor suggest the combination set forth in Applicant's claim 11.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the Potters et al reference neither shows nor suggests the combination of features recited in either claim 11 or claim 17, and that these claims define patentable invention and are allowable.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and so are allowable with claim 11 for the reasons given immediately above.

Further regarding claims 12, 13, 18 and 19, the Borys patent reference was combined with Potters et al for rejection of these claims. The Borys patent does not disclose anything about the nature of the mixer 45 other than: "a powered mechanical device or simply an enlarged conduit filled with variously sized balls that create a tortuous passageway for the product and resultant mixing of the materials"(Borys, Col 3, l. 20-24). So Borys doesn't show or suggest a manifold as recited in Applicant's claim 11 (the parent

to claims 12 and 13). Also, as mentioned above, Potters et al discloses no such thing as a manifold as recited in Applicant's Claim 11. So even though Borys discloses one-way valves, it does not suggest them in the combination of details recited in Applicant's claim 11. Moreover, one-way valves were known well enough at the time of Potters et al invention to have been included if there was any reason to do so. Yet, Potters neither discloses nor suggests it and Borys contains no suggestion of any reason that they should be added to a device such as Potters. For these additional reasons, it is submitted that claims 12 and 13 define patentable invention and are allowable.

Claims 15 and 16 were indicated allowable if amended to incorporate the subject matter of independent claim 11 but, since it is submitted that claim 11 does define patentable invention and is allowable, claims 15 and 16 are merely resubmitted.

Claim 17 was rejected as fully met by Potters et al. Here, too, as mentioned above with regard to claim 11, the claim recites that the inlet end of the blending and dispensing assembly is configured to fit and seal against the base product delivery end outlet of a flowable mix dispenser head. Potters simply discloses the hopper 6. There is no suggestion that the hopper be configured to fit, much less seal, against any base product delivery end outlet of anything, much less the outlet of a flowable mix dispenser head. Thus, as previously stated herein, it is submitted that claim 17 defines invention patentable over the references and is allowable.

Claims 18-22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 17, so it is submitted that they are allowable along with claim 17. However, as to claim 18, there is an amendment to overcome the Section 112 rejection. This claim is amended, adopting language along the lines suggested in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, and which suggestion is appreciated.

Claims 21 and 22 were only objected to and indicated allowable if placed in independent form. Since these claims depend from claim 17, and it is submitted that claim 17 is patentable over the references as discussed and for the reasons given above, claims 21 and 22 are resubmitted herewith.

It is believed and submitted that all of the claims in the application as now presented do patentably define over the references and should be allowed. Allowance thereof is solicited so that this application may mature into a patent.

Respectfully submitted:



Joseph A. Naughton  
Reg. No. 19,814  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,  
McNett & Henry LLP  
Bank One Center Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456